

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-39 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 37 are independent.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-9, 15-17, 19-27, 30, 31 and 37-39 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Doigan et al. U.S. Patent 5,606,154 ("Doigan") in view of Newville et al. U.S. Patent 6,349,797 ("Newville"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as follows.

The present invention provides an elevator communication system comprising a cab computer that communicates with an elevator control system. In the specification, Applicant defines an elevator control system/controller as a controller that is part of a modern-day elevator system, such as manufactured by Otis, Thyssen-Krupp or any other elevator manufacturer (see, e.g., page 17, lines 21-23). The elevator controller is provided by the elevator manufacturer as part of the original elevator installation, and controls the elevator functions. Independent Claim 1 recites that the cab computer: (1) receives data from the elevator control system; (2) chooses specific information content based on the data received from the elevator control system; and (3) presents the chosen information content on the display.

Doigan teaches timed advertising in elevators and other shuttles in a manner that assures advertising value, including not playing ads during some time periods (i.e., hour exclusions), avoiding assignment changes that could interrupt the message, and charging only for ads that run completely (see Abstract). Doigan further discloses an elevator management system that is associated with the original elevator installation. This elevator management system determines

times when ads should not be played, for example during heavy traffic or elevator renovation. However, the elevator management system does not determine the content of the ads based upon these elevator conditions, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 37.

Assuming, arguendo, that Doigan discloses a “cab computer” that receives data from the elevator control/management system, Doigan still fails to disclose that the cab computer chooses specific information content based on the data received from the elevator control/management system. The present invention teaches that the information content (i.e., specific type of ad) is chosen by the cab computer based upon data received from the elevator control system. By contrast, Doigan merely teaches that information is only displayed if certain tests determine whether there are no hour exclusions for the ads. In other words, Doigan does not teach any form of choosing information content based upon data received from another source. Moreover, Doigan’s “cab computer” does not make decisions regarding the type of ad to be played based upon information received from the elevator management system.

The Office Action states that Doigan does not disclose a cab computer and attempts to cure this deficiency by applying the teachings of Newville to teach the use of a server, scheduler and graphical user interface. The Office Action further provides that “(t)he display is only operated if occupancy detector 42 determines that a rider is present”. However, there is no indication in Newville that occupancy detector 42 is part of an elevator control system that is part of the original elevator installation. Moreover, Newville fails to disclose a cab computer that chooses specific information content based on the data received from an elevator control system.

In view of the above, the rejection of Claims 1 and 37 (and Claims 2-9, 15-17, 19-27, 30, 31 and 38-39, which depend from these claims) as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Doigan in view of Newville respectfully has been traversed.

The Office Action rejects Claims 10-14, 16-18, 28, 33, 34 and 39 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Doigan in view of Newville and further in view of Amo U.S. Patent No. 5,844,181 (“Amo”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as follows. Claims 1 and 37 are distinguished from Doigan and Newville as discussed above. Amo fails to cure the deficiencies of Doigan and Newville. In view of the above, the rejection Claims 10-14, 16-18, 28, 33, 34 and 39 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Doigan in view of Newville and further in view of Amo, respectfully has been traversed.

The Office Action rejects Claim 29 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Doigan in view of Newville and further in view of Yabe et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,132,681 (“Yabe”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as follows. Claim 1 is distinguished from Doigan and Newville as discussed above. Yabe fails to cure the deficiencies of Doigan and Newville. In view of the above, the rejection Claim 29 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Doigan in view of Newville and further in view of Yabe, respectfully has been traversed.

The Office Action rejects Claims 32, 35 and 36 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Doigan in view of Newville and further in view of Tsuji U.S. Patent No. 4,839,631 (“Tsuji”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as follows. Claim 1 is distinguished from Doigan and Newville as discussed above. Tsuji fails to cure the deficiencies of Doigan and Newville. In view of the above, the rejection Claims 32, 35 and 36 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Doigan in view of Newville and further in view of Tsuji, respectfully has been traversed.

**Conclusion**

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection has been traversed as to the independent claims and all claims depending from them, and that the application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss remaining issues, if there are any.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this and concurrent replies to charge payment (or credit any overpayment) to Deposit Account No. 50-2298 for any additional fees required under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

2/26/2004  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David E. Heisey  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 42,651

c/o            LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON  
                  & SCRIPPS LLP  
                  11988 El Camino Real, Ste. 200  
                  San Diego, California 92130  
                  Telephone No.: (858) 720-6300